

REMARKS

In the Office Action mailed on September 8, 2004, the Examiner rejected claims 1-14 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 5,842,196 to Agarwal et al. ("Agarwal") in view of U.S. Patent No. 5,842,020 to Faustini ("Faustini"). Applicants hereby amend claims 1 and 3 to correct antecedent basis and grammatical errors, and present new claims 15-20. As a result, claims 1-20 are now pending. Applicants respectfully traverse the Examiner's rejection. Further examination and review in view of the remarks below are respectfully requested.

Applicants' techniques are directed to a client server system having a thin client interface, an application server, and an object manager interposed between the thin client and the application server. In some cases, the object manager is a multi-tasking, multi-thread object manager that is capable of handling requests from multiple clients by maintaining the status of each client in a separate object manager thread.

Claims 1-14 stand rejected over Agarwal in view of Faustini. Agarwal describes a client server database system with improved methods for performing record updates. The described method updates records in a manner which allows a substantial portion of the work to be performed in direct mode – i.e., update of the record is performed in linear fashion or in one pass – whenever possible, thereby avoiding the inefficiency of re-reading records, as is required in a deferred update approach which requires two passes.

All of Applicants' claims include the common features of (1) a thin client interface, (2) an application server comprising one or more business objects and business components, and (3) an object manager interposed between the client and the application server. In rejecting the claims, the Examiner appears to indicate that Agarwal's general introductory discussion of client/server database systems (col. 2, lines 13-15; col. 3, lines 35-46; col. 4, lines 26-67) corresponds to Applicants' provision of a thin client interface, an application server, and an object manager interposed between the client and the application server.

Applicants respectfully disagree. Agarwal does not disclose, suggest or teach a thin client interface, nor does it disclose, suggest or teach an object manager interposed between the client and the application server. Instead, Agarwal merely describes a client/server database system having one or more clients connected to a server via a network. In particular, the clients comprise one or more standalone terminals – i.e., standalone workstations, dumb terminals, and personal computers – connected to the database server system using a conventional network. (col. 4, lines 29-41). These standalone terminals are not thin client interfaces, and Applicants can find in Agarwal no such disclosure or suggestion.

According to Agarwal, the database server system generally operates a process, independently of the clients, running under a server operating system. (col. 4, lines 44-47). Thus, the clients are connected to this independent server process via the network. (described at col. 4, lines 29-47 and shown in Fig. 2A). This is in contrast to Applicants' thin client interface and application server that are connected via an object manager. Applicants can find in Agarwal no such disclosure or suggestion.

Further, in rejecting these claims, the Examiner conceded that "Agarwal does not specifically mention said application server comprising one or more of business objects, and business components," but asserted that "Faustini mentions business application objects and components (Faustini Col 8 Lines 12-57)" and that "it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention to apply Faustini to Agarwal, providing Agarwal the benefit of including servers having business objects and components which would be supported by numerous companies as taught by Faustini Col 8 Lines 40-45."

Applicants respectfully disagree. The cited passage of Faustini is a general discussion of the emergence of Sun's Java as a serious programming language capable of tackling the most sophisticated business applications, and Microsoft's ActiveX as a competing technology to Java. (col. 8, lines 12-57). Applicants respectfully submit that

mere mention of Java as a suitable programming language for writing business applications does not constitute a disclosure, suggestion or teaching of Applicants' application server comprising one or more business objects and business components. Applicants' business objects are applications (see Specification page 5, lines 25-27), which, in some instances may contain applets and application objects (see Specification page 2, lines 27-28).

Further, according to the Manual of Patent Examining Procedure and controlling case law, the motivation to combine or extend prior art references under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) cannot be based on mere common knowledge and common sense as to benefits that would result from such combination or modification. Instead, such motivation must be based upon specific teaching in the prior art, such as a specific suggestion in a prior art reference.

To establish a prima facie case of obviousness, three basic criteria must be met. First, there must be some suggestion or motivation, either in the references themselves or in the knowledge generally available to one of ordinary skill in the art, to modify the reference or to combine reference teachings. Second, there must be a reasonable expectation of success. Finally, the prior art reference (or references when combined) must teach or suggest all the claim limitations.

The teaching or suggestion to make the claimed combination and the reasonable expectation of success must both be found in the prior art, not in applicant's disclosure. In re Vaeck, 947 F.2d 488, 20 U.S.P.Q.2d 1438 (Fed. Cir. 1991). Manual of Patent Examining Procedure, § 2143 (emphasis added).

In contrast to this well-established standard, the motivation to combine these two prior art references in accordance with the claimed invention provided by the Examiner is based solely on the alleged beneficial results that would be produced by this combination, without identifying any motivation from the prior art that supports the extension as is required.

Even assuming that a motivation to combine the references exists, the combination of Agarwal and Faustini does not disclose, suggest or teach all of Applicants' features for at least the reasons presented above.

Newly added claims 15-20 recite features similar to those recited in claim 1, which are neither taught nor suggested by Agarwal or Faustini as discussed above.

Conclusion

In view of the foregoing, Applicants respectfully submit that claims 1-20 are allowable, and ask that this application be passed to allowance. If the Examiner has any questions or believes a telephone conference would expedite prosecution of this application, the Examiner is encouraged to call the undersigned at (206) 359-8000.

Dated:

12/3/24

Respectfully Submitted,

By 

Steven D. Lawrenz

Registration No.: 37,376

PERKINS COIE LLP

P.O. Box 1247

Seattle, Washington 98111-1247

(206) 359-8000

(206) 359-7198 (Fax)

Attorneys for Applicant